

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed November 8, 2005, the Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 6, 9, 11-14, 17, and 19, and to cancel claims 5, 10, and 18. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-17, and 19-21 are presented for examination

Claim Objections

The Office has objected to claims 13 and 17 due to informalities. Claims 13 and 17 have been amended to obviate this objection.

Section 103 rejection

The Office has rejected claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Janko* in view of *Zhu*. However, the Office indicated that previously pending claim 5, which depended on claim 1, would be in condition for allowance if rewritten to include all of the limitations of its base claim (1) and any intervening claims (no intervening claims). Applicant proposes to amended claim 1 to include the limitations of previously pending claim 5, and to cancel claim 5. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Office has rejected claim 9 and its dependent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Janko* in view of *Zhu*. However, the Office indicated that previously pending claim 10, which depended on claim 9, would be in condition for allowance if rewritten to include all of the limitations of its base claim (9) and any intervening claims (no intervening claims). Applicant proposes to amended claim 9 to include the limitations of previously pending claim 10, and to cancel claim 10. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Office has rejected claim 14 and its dependent claims 15-17 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Janko* in view of *Zhu*. However, the Office indicated that previously pending claim 18, which depended on claim 14, would be in condition for allowance if rewritten to include all of the limitations of its base claim (14) and any intervening claims (no intervening claims). Applicant proposes to amended claim 14 to include the

Applicant : Sudheer Sirivara et al.
Serial No. : 09/870,366
Filed : May 30, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-477001 / P11156

limitations of previously pending claim 18, and to cancel claim 18. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.


The foregoing amendments are believed to place the entire application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests entry of those amendments and prompt allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 referencing attorney docket no. 10559-477001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/30/05



Tonya S. Drake
Reg. No. 57,861

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906